

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

LASANDRA HILLSON,  
STEVEN BOHLER and  
ASHLEY SCHMIDT,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No. 2:15-CV-10803  
Judge Laurie J. Michelson  
Magistrate Judge Anthony P. Patti

KELLY SERVICES, INC.,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT’S MOTION TO STAY ALL  
PROCEEDINGS (DE 18) and STAYING CASE**

For the reasons stated on the record in the Court’s oral opinion of this date, including its analysis of all of the factors discussed in *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 255 (1936), Defendant’s motion to stay all proceedings is **GRANTED**, and the case is **STAYED** until such time as the United States Supreme Court issues a written opinion on the merits in *Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins*, No. 13-1339. The Court finds that a stay is warranted, *inter alia*, because *Spokeo* has the high potential to be completely dispositive of the instant case<sup>1</sup> and because judicial

---

<sup>1</sup> See, *Michael v. Ghee*, 325 F. Supp.2d 829, 831-832 (N.D. Ohio 2004).

economy favors a limited delay in awaiting the *Spokeo* decision.<sup>2</sup> In addition and alternatively, even in the absence of dispositive motion practice, the Supreme Court's ruling in *Spokeo* has the high potential to directly impact this Court's anticipated class certification ruling, because it would appear to bear upon the issue of whether the proposed class members have Article III standing under the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. §1681, *et. seq.*<sup>3</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: July 15, 2015

s/Anthony P. Patti

Anthony P. Patti

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

I hereby certified that a copy of the foregoing document was sent to parties of record on July 15, 2015, electronically and/or by U.S. Mail.

s/ Michael Williams

Case Manager for the

Honorable Anthony P. Patti

---

<sup>2</sup> See, *Michael*, 325 F.Supp.2d at 833; see also, *Beydoun v. Holder*, No. 14-cv-13812, 2015 WL 631948, \*3-\*4 (E.D. Mich. Feb. 13, 2015) (Levy, J.) (opinion and order granting defendants' motion to stay).

<sup>3</sup> See, *Ramirez v. Trans Union, LLC*, No. 3:12-cv-00632-JSC, \*2 (N.D. Cal. June 22, 2015) (Corley, M.J.) (order granting motion to stay action) (DE 25-1).